REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3, 4, 25-27, and 30-40 are now pending. Claims 28 and 29 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Claims 26 and 33-35 are amended, and new claims 37-40 are added. No new matter has been added. Applicants wish to clarify that claims 1, 2, and 5-24 were previously canceled in a Preliminary Amendment.

Claims 3, 4, 26, 27, 31, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,043,809 to Holehan ("Holehan"). Claims 25, 32, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holehan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,371,846 to Bates ("Bates"). Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holehan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,418,549 to Anderson et al. ("Anderson"). In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 3 is directed to a method for providing absolute scrolling of a document. The claimed method includes sensing a pointer sliding along a touch-sensitive surface, determining a location of the pointer while the pointer is sliding, and scrolling the document to a location in the document that corresponds to the location of the pointer relative to the touch-sensitive surface.

Holehan discloses a scroll mode at col. 4, lines. 20-40, in which touching any location between the end portions of scroll bar sensors 122-126 causes a document portion to be displayed corresponding to the relative locations within the sensors that are touched. However, Holehan fails to teach or suggest that the sensed locations are of a <u>sliding</u> pointer as claimed. Instead, this mode of Holehan senses successive different locations of the scroll bar sensors without any sliding.

The remaining scroll modes described in Holehan also do not teach or suggest all the features recited in claim 1. For example, the scroll modes disclosed in Holehan at col. 4, lines. 41-67 do not scroll to a location in the document that corresponds to the location of a pointer relative to a touch-sensitive surface, as claimed.

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Holehan.

Independent claim 26 is amended only to incorporate now-canceled claim 28. Thus, the rejection of claim 28 will be addressed with regard to claim 26. Claim 26 as amended recites a method including determining a location of a pointer relative to a touch-sensitive surface, moving a document to a location in the document that corresponds to the location of the pointer, and rounding the location in the document to a nearest text line.

As correctly indicated in the Office Action, Holehan does not teach or suggest rounding the location in a document to a nearest text line as claimed. The Office Action instead relies on Anderson, which discloses using a scroll bar to select and view exact pages of a document. Abstract; col. 5, line 57, to col. 6, line 6. However, Anderson does not teach or suggest, and is totally unconcerned with, rounding to the nearest text line. Accordingly, it is submitted that neither Holehan nor Anderson, either alone or in combination as proposed, teaches or suggests every feature recited in claim 26.

Independent claim 33 as amended recites a method including determining a first location in a document that corresponds to a first location of a pointer relative to a touch-sensitive surface, determining a first text line nearest the first location in the document; and moving the document to the first text line. For at least similar reasons as those discussed above with regard to claim 26, it is submitted that neither Holehan nor Anderson, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests determining a text line nearest a location in a document.

The remaining dependent claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable independent claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. In addition, Bates also fails to make up for the deficiencies of Holehan and Anderson.

For example, neither Holehan, Anderson, nor Bates, either alone or in any combination or sub-combination, teaches or suggests rounding a location in a document to a nearest paragraph, as recited in claim 37. Again, Anderson mentions only selecting and viewing exact pages of a document, which has nothing to do with rounding to a nearest paragraph.

All rejections having been addressed, allowance and notification of the same are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or believe that a telephone call would be beneficial, she is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 9, 2005

By: _Henry D. Fedonek #35,509_
for Jordan N. Bodner
Registration No. 42,338

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001